

Fund Finance Friday



The Value of the Valuation

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Table of Contents:

- [Finding Value in the Valuation](#)
- [‘Fund Finance Friday: Industry Conversations’ — Fund Finance Innovations & Updates \(30 Minutes\)](#)
- [ILPA Releases Guidance on Subscription Line Transparency](#)
- [Upcoming Wildgen Webinar: A Decade of Fund Finance](#)
- [BNP Paribas Closes €2.3 Billion Syndicated ESG-linked Facility](#)
- [Buyouts Article on Fund Level Leverage](#)
- [The Drawdown’s Coverage of Fund Finance](#)
- [PFCFO: NAV Specialists See Surge in Demand](#)
- [Wes Misson to Present on Trends in Fund Finance](#)
- [Private Funds CFO Article on Subscription Facilities for SMAs](#)
- [Secondaries Investor Publishes Final Part in Its Series on Leverage During Covid-19, Analyzing Impact on Portfolio Company Debt](#)
- [Recommended Reading](#)

Finding Value in the Valuation

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

A few *FFF* editions ago, I described how the appetite for NAV-backed facilities had increased significantly across the private markets in a post-COVID world and how the structures of these facilities were becoming more flexible as they attracted the interest of larger managers, particularly in the primary private equity space. However, whilst facility terms and structures are evolving, the fundamental concept and benchmark underlying these transactions is the “loan to value” ratio. We know that the Q1 marks have not given us any meaningful visibility on the impact of COVID on investments and portfolio companies and that the market is anticipating that visibility via the Q2 marks which managers are in the process of preparing. NAV financiers to existing portfolios are in active dialogue with managers to try to gauge the anticipated impact on borrowing bases of asset write-downs, and lenders are grappling with how to value portfolios in the absence of the Q2 marks for underwriting new financings.

Whilst valuations have been tested many times before, we have arguably never seen a crisis hit this quickly and this extensively across all markets, sectors and industries, and, as a result, lenders and advisers are looking at valuations and valuation methodologies with much more scrutiny than ever before. Helpful guidance has been issued in relation to the factors managers should and should not take into account when assessing the value of their portfolios, which make sense from an investor long-term investment outlook perspective but raises the question: Are the current methodologies and guidelines really fit for purpose in the context of a NAV-financing? In this piece, I focus on how managers are valuing their portfolios, where there may be a disconnect between the usefulness of the valuation for investors on the one hand and financiers on the other, and where additional protections are being sought by lenders in the market underwriting new NAV-financings.

Where it began

Whilst private markets participants entered 2020 anticipating and preparing for some form of short- to mid-term market correction, it's fair to say that no one could have predicted the scale and suddenness with which the COVID crisis would hit and impact markets globally. The effect on the public markets was visible virtually immediately, with equity markets globally dropping by as much as 30%, but the time lags associated with private fund managers' calculations and reporting of “net asset value” has meant that investors and financiers to the private markets have had to wait significantly longer to see the impact of COVID on portfolio company and investment performance. As we approach the end of Q2, we're at a juncture whereby:

- lenders to existing portfolios are preparing to see marks released in the summer which will more meaningfully reflect the impact of COVID on investment portfolios and whether or not this will result in any LTV breaches;
- at the same time, we're seeing a rush by managers to lock in NAV-backed facilities to provide liquidity either for supporting existing portfolio companies or for strategic acquisitions, in each case prior to the Q2 valuations being released.

Approaches and applications of valuation methodologies have advanced significantly since the GFC, but how confident should lenders be in the numbers they are presented with? Should they and can they apply further discounts to these numbers? Should they and can they require an independent valuation and, if so, how often, what should be the scope and who should pay for that valuation? Whilst these factors were considered to a degree prior to COVID in the context of NAV-backed facilities, they have become of paramount importance in a post-COVID world.

How are managers currently valuing their portfolios?

Whilst there are a number of standards and guidelines available to private markets managers to assist in ascribing value to investment portfolios, the most widely adopted standard is the International Private Equity and Venture Capital Valuation Guidelines. In response to the challenges being faced by managers in valuing their portfolios post-COVID, on 31 March 2020 the IPEV board issued special guidance as to factors that should and should not be taken into account in determining the “Fair Value” of investments, the widely accepted benchmark for private equity valuations. The special guidance clarifies that “Fair Value” should be interpreted as the value that would be received by a manager in an orderly sale of the relevant investment using market participant assumptions as at the measurement date. The concept of “Fair Value” does not assume a fire sale of the relevant investment and should take into account both macro and micro market conditions which are known and knowable as at the relevant date. Managers should be continuing to use appropriate comparables from the public markets whilst being mindful of the differences in inputs and drivers underlying those public market valuations.

Ironically, whilst market participants anticipate that the Q2 marks are likely to show greater value declines than the Q1 valuations, managers are actually in a much better position to assess more accurately the impact of COVID on underlying businesses. We have far more knowns and knowables reaching the end of Q2 than was the case for Q1, which should make those numbers and calculations more robust. Managers have now had the opportunity to evaluate their portfolios at both a macro and micro level. They are now much better placed to understand which portfolio companies need more liquidity and, as lock-downs begin to ease, which portfolio companies can begin to recover and those which are still likely to be in some form of distress. The ranges of outcomes now is narrower for portfolio companies than was foreseen at the end of Q1. Certain industries have recovered well, and other sectors will clearly continue to struggle. We have also seen the backdrop of public markets stabilising and the impact of government stimulus. In that respect, whilst there is undoubtedly still uncertainty at both a macro and micro level and whilst we anticipate that the Q2 numbers as a whole may not look pretty, we should have more confidence that these numbers are more reflective of where businesses really are and where they are likely to go which should make assessing “net asset value” for the purpose of determining compliance with financial covenants and for underwriting new financings much easier.

But is that really the case?

There is still a great deal of subjectivity in valuing private assets. Whilst a rebounding of the public markets is a factor managers can take into account, there is very little comparable data available in the private markets themselves given acquisition and loan origination activity has all but halted, which makes direct comparables very difficult. Is the strong rebound in the public markets really justifiable and how much weight should managers be giving this to write up investments? Managers have to look at their investments on an investment-by-investment/company-by-company basis and come to a view as to the outlook for a particular business, taking all relevant factors into account and understanding that this assessment may well be different from one manager to another with similar portfolios. In addition, whilst “fair value” is the universal reporting standard in the U.S., there are more variations applicable to European funds, where different jurisdictions have different accounting provisions and reporting conventions, making a true “like for like” comparison much more difficult.

Whilst the guidance issued by IPEV certainly makes sense for investors in the private markets with mid-/long-term investment outlooks, a financier lending against a portfolio of investments is looking for the valuation to accurately reflect the value that would be obtained were the lender to foreclose on the portfolio at any given point in time during the life of the facility. This draws a fundamental distinction between the “value” of these valuations to investors and managers, versus the value to financiers. This dislocation has led many lenders looking to provide new financings against investment portfolios to seek to mitigate this risk by:

- reducing LTVs to more conservative levels than those seen pre-COVID or maintain previously seen LTV levels but with a significant upward pricing adjustment;
- conducting their own valuations of the portfolios either at the outset of the financing for the purpose of striking the initial NAV and having the ability to revalue the portfolio on an ongoing basis whether internally or via an independent valuation agent. Although the concept of re-valuing portfolios was seen in NAV trades pre-COVID, in our experience it is now rare to see a NAV financing which does not include revaluation mechanics to some degree. The points of negotiation will be:
 - What are the triggers for the revaluation? If the lender does not consistently calculate the adjusted net asset value throughout the life of the facility, is the revaluation right triggered by LTV hitting a certain threshold, the lender reasonably suspecting that the LTV threshold is or will be breached and/or a material drop in a relevant index?
 - How many times can a lender revalue a portfolio? Again, if the lender isn't already calculating the adjusted net asset value, how many times over the life of the facility can the revaluation right be exercised and, if this is limited, what should be the position if a third party or internal valuation by the lender consistently demonstrates that the portfolio is overvalued by the relevant manager?
 - What is the scope of the revaluation? A lender will want the entirety of the valuation methodology *and* its application to be capable of being reviewed, not just the application, and by reference to all relevant data.
 - Which independent valuation agents should be appointed? The approaches taken by valuation agents in their analyses can differ, which will have a material effect on the direction of the valuation.
 - What happens to distributions whilst revaluations are being carried out? Clearly, from a lender perspective, it will be imperative that cash is trapped until the revaluation has been carried out, but what time periods should apply

here such that the cash isn't blocked unnecessarily for a long period of time?

Clearly, the need from managers for liquidity solutions to manage their portfolios in circumstances where neither internal capital nor additional headroom within sub-lines is available represents a significant opportunity for financiers with credit appetite to underwrite investment portfolios. But the usual valuation methodology and application thereof by a manager may not be sufficient for a lender's purposes – arriving at a settled approach on the valuation overlaying the valuation carried out by the manager will be critical.


'Fund Finance Friday: Industry Conversations' — Fund Finance Innovations & Updates (30 Minutes)

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Industry Conversations

In today's video version of *Fund Finance Friday: Industry Conversations*, Charlie Owens, Managing Director at Signature Bank, gives an update on what the bank is seeing and doing in the market currently; Ken Pierce, newly minted CEO of Lockton Capital Markets, describes the NAV-financing his firm is structuring and placing with insurance company lenders; and Cadwalader's Sam Hutchinson gives an update on the European market, with a deep dive into the rapidly expanding and evolving NAV-lending space.

If you cannot access the video below, [please click here](#).



ILPA Releases Guidance on Subscription Line Transparency

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Earlier this week the Institutional Limited Partners Association (ILPA) released follow-on guidance regarding the use of subscription facilities, titled “Enhancing Transparency Around Subscription Lines of Credit.” The guidance primarily focuses on GPs providing enhanced transparency around the outstanding balance of a fund’s subscription facility to enable investors to better forecast the amount of upcoming capital calls and manage their liquidity. The guidance is available [here](#).

Upcoming Wildgen Webinar: A Decade of Fund Finance

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Tune in to Wildgen's Michael Mbayi as he hosts the first session of the newly launched "Fund Finance" webinar series. Panel members include industry leaders George Cherry (Citi Private Bank), Michael Mascia (Cadwalader), Paul Tannenbaum (Mayer Brown) and Olivier Vermeulen (Paul Hastings), focusing on the evolution of Fund Finance during the last decade and liquidity solutions it may provide during the COVID-19 pandemic. More information is available [here](#).

BNP Paribas Closes €2.3 Billion Syndicated ESG-linked Facility

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

BNP Paribas recently closed a milestone subscription credit facility – notable for implementing an ESG-driven pricing, the size of the facility and for being widely syndicated. The facility to EQT IX Fund was initially sized at €2.3 billion with an upper limit of €5.0 billion. BNP Paribas acted as Agent, Sustainability Agent and co-Sustainability Agent with Nordic financial services group SEB. The facility implements quarterly sustainability-driven key performance indicators, which are to be audited annually, and with the fulfillment of these objectives impacting the facility margin. Broadly, the facility sets out to incentivize boardroom gender equality and renewable energy transition, each supported by a sustainable governance. Guillaume Hartog, Head of Subscription Finance at BNP Paribas, commented that while private equity is still a new frontier for green financing, BNP Paribas is committed to being a strong promoter of sustainable finance. More on the facility [here](#) and [here](#).

Buyouts Article on Fund Level Leverage

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

The private equity press covered fund finance extensively this week. Chris Witkowsky of *Buyouts* published an article titled “GPs ask LPs for more ability to use fund-level leverage to prop older investments.” The article, [available here](#), covers fund efforts to inject liquidity into portfolio companies via NAV-oriented borrowing at the fund level.

The Drawdown's Coverage of Fund Finance

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

The Drawdown featured multiple stories on fund finance this week, covering the ILPA Guidance, EQT's ESG-Linked Subscription Facility, and a historical piece from guest contributor Michael Mbayi of Wildgen. Here are the articles:

- [“ILPA wants more transparency on sub lines”](#)
- [“EQT secures largest ESG-linked sub line”](#)
- [“Comment: A decade of fund finance in Luxembourg”](#)

PFCFO: NAV Specialists See Surge in Demand

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Deal flow is up meaningfully for NAV lenders, according to a June 1 *Private Funds CFO* article citing a number of market specialists. Liquidity continues to be in high demand at both fund and portfolio investment level, and alternative lenders in the NAV space are the primary beneficiaries. Banks, in many cases, are focusing on servicing their existing books, according to the article. The use of NAV facilities has lagged in the past, in part because the bespoke nature of the market raises upfront costs, non-bank lender cost-of-capital influences pricing, and because of the underwriting and administrative complexity. In the current market, however, funds and NAV specialists are motivated to work through these challenges. The full article is available [here](#).

Wes Misson to Present on Trends in Fund Finance

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Cadwalader Fund Finance partner Wes Misson will be speaking on a panel titled “Trends in Fund Finance in Light of COVID-19” as part of Practising Law Institute’s (PLI) “One-Hour Briefings” program on July 14. This live webcast will provide an overview of financing document considerations arising from the global coronavirus crisis. Wes will be joined by Ramya Tiller of Debevoise & Plimpton LLP to discuss, among other things:

- Trends in subscription credit facilities
- Expanded usage of NAV facilities and related considerations
- GP facilities

For more information and to register, please click [here](#).

Private Funds CFO Article on Subscription Facilities for SMAs

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

In a *Private Funds CFO* article, Kathryn Cecil, Jons Lehmann and Jan Sysel, partners at Fried Frank, discuss how to mitigate the increased concentration risks that lenders face when entering into subscription facilities with SMAs, many of which have only a single investor. Specifically, the article mentions making revisions to an SMA's organizational documents, preparing investor consent letters and converting certain exclusion events under a commingled fund subscription facility into events of default under an SMA subscription facility. The article is accessible [here](#).

Secondaries Investor Publishes Final Part in Its Series on Leverage During Covid-19, Analyzing Impact on Portfolio Company Debt

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

Secondaries Investor details potential COVID-19 fallout on GP-led transactions and various options for completing deals when in need of additional capital to support investments. Recycling of investor distributions, preferred equity and NAV-based debt are discussed as possibilities for mature funds. Read the article [here](#).

Recommended Reading

June 12, 2020 | Issue No. 81

- Real estate funds are facing a host of challenges ranging from the immediate – the impact of lockdowns on tenant ability or willingness to pay rent – to long-term questions on durable changes from population migration and lasting changes in the demand for and use of space. Of course, for fund managers that get it right, the current environment presents generational investment opportunities. *Globe Street* recently outlined potential strategies for real estate fund managers to consider to capitalize on the moment, including extending the fund investment period to preserve available capital or accelerating the launch of a successor fund, along with highlighting related subscription facility considerations. That article is available [here](#).